

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 22 and 28 being the independent claims. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 14-16, 21, 22, 27 and 28 are sought to be amended. Claims 31-35 have been previously canceled due to a restriction requirement. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent Application No. 2001/0003828 A1 (hereinafter referred to as “Peterson”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to claims 1-15 since Peterson does not appear to teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1, 6 and 11 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to include a similar feature of receiving a request over a back channel, where the medium (that is used to multicast the content related to the request) and back channel are not the same. Thus, in independent

claims 1, 6 and 11, the received request and the multicasted content are sent over two different paths. Peterson does not appear to teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 6 and 11 (and their dependent claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15) are patentable over Peterson. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 16-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent Application No. 2003/0206554 A1 (hereinafter referred to as “Dillon”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections with regard to claims 16-30 since Dillon does not appear to teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 16, 22 and 28 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 16, 22 and 28 have been amended to include a similar feature of sending a request over a back channel, where the medium (that is used to receive content related to the request) and back channel are not the same. Thus, in independent claims 16, 22 and 28, the sent request and the received content are sent over two different paths. Dillon does not appear to teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 16, 22 and 28 (and their dependent claims 17-21, 23-27, 29 and 30) are patentable over Dillon. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: 5-16-05

/Molly A. McCall/  
Molly A. McCall  
Registration No. 46,126  
(703) 633-3311

P8981 Reply to Nonfinal OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

5-16-05

Date of Deposit

Katherine Jennings  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Signature

5-16-05  
Date